DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 079 869 EA 005 382

AUTHOR	Rocher, Guy
TITLE	What the Individual Expects of the School. CTF Project on Education Finance: Document 2.
INSTITUTION	Canadian Teachers' Federation, Ottawa (Ontario).
REPORT NO	CTF-C-72306
PUB DATE	Sep 72
NOTE	31p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Canadian Teachers' Federation, 110 Argyle Avenue, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada K2P 1B4 ($1.25)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Educational Finance; Educational Innovation; Educational Objectives; Educational Philosophy; *Educational Responsibility; Educational Trends; Individualized Instruction; *Individual Needs; *Relevance (Education); *School Role; *Student Needs; Teacher Responsibility
IDENTIFIERS	*Canada

ABSTRACT

This booklet is the second in a three part series dealing with individual and societal expectations of education in Canada and the relationship between basic goals and the principles of financing. The main body of the document examines the current state of public expenditures of the school as an institution serving the needs of the individual. The first part of the paper records objective observations and impressions, while the second part presents the author's personal viewpoint. The author first considers the plurality of publics which the educational system must serve, the conflicts of values in these different publics, the school of today and the society of tomorrow, contradictory expectations, the role of the teacher, and academic and vocational aspirations. He next looks at the school system of tomorrow, which he sees as an educational system so different that it defies comparison to what we know as an educational system today. The paper comments briefly on some ingrained ideas that now must be questioned, the nonsupporter of education, the problem of motivation, individualizing mass education, the increase in individual intelligence, the increase in the number of symbolically oriented people, and the changing ideas of young people and their expectations of education. A short bibliography is included. Related documents are EA 005 381 and EA 005 383. (Author/DN)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

C-72306

ED 079869

WHAT THE INDIVIDUAL EXPECTS OF THE SCHOOL

Guy Rocher

CTF Project on Education Finance: Document 2

EA 005 382

CANADIAN TEACHERS' FEDERATION
110 Argyle Avenue
Ottawa Ontario
K2P 1B4

September 1972

CTF PROJECT ON EDUCATION FINANCE

Document One: **Woodrow S. Lloyd.** What Society May Properly Expect of the School.

Document Two: **Guy Rocher.** What the Individual Expects of the School.

Document Three: **Walter Hettich, Barry Lacombe, Max Von Zur-Muehlen.** Basic Goals and the Financing of Education.

FOREWORD

The late sixties in Canada saw a rapid worsening of the climate for educators, who had enjoyed something like unquestioning acceptance for a brief period of years. American criticisms of the school system were gaining wide currency in Canada. On the one hand, it was asserted that the schools were tailored to the purposes of a specific economic system (with its social and political concomitants), and that that system was faltering if not altogether discredited. At the other pole, critics argued that the schools had become inefficient in serving the essential purposes of the prevailing social system. In the meantime, there was growing evidence that young people were increasingly unwilling to accept the authority of the school as a training and selecting device, and that parents and communities were unable or unwilling to compel them to go on doing so.

Against this background, the governmental agencies responsible for raising money for the support of the schools were beginning to assert with increasing firmness that taxpayers would no longer tolerate the growth of educational costs, and various restrictive measures were making their appearance.

The CTF Advisory Committee on Education Finance, which had for many years been concerning itself with the problem of financing the many unmet needs in education, concluded that the time was ripe for an attempt to define, at a basic level, the nature of the gap between current concepts of the proper function of the school in Canadian society and the reality of that function, and also the nature of the gap between current concepts of propriety in the public financing of schooling and the reality of the present situation. This would be the starting point for an attempt to explore the implications of an effort of improvement, and eventually to suggest some basic principles on which a rationale for the public financing of education should rest.

Accordingly, invitations were addressed, in the summer of 1970, to certain eminent Canadians to present their view of the concepts prevailing, at the present time, in Canadian society, regarding individual and societal expectations of education and the relationship between basic goals and principles of financing. In this paper, Dr. Guy Rocher, Professor of Sociology, University of Montreal, presents his views on the current state of public expectation of the school as an institution serving

the needs of the individual. Dr. Rocher is well known as a commentator on social trends in Canada, and in particular for his contribution to the work of the Parent Commission in Quebec.

The other two papers in the series are by Dr. Woodrow S. Lloyd and by Drs. Walter Hettich, Barry Lacombe and Max von Zur-Muehlen. The three papers in the series have provided the input for a series of seminars beginning in May 1971. A final report on the enquiry is expected to be published by the Canadian Teachers' Federation during the winter of 1972-73.

Norman Goble
Secretary General
Canadian Teachers' Federation

CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
OBSERVATIONS AND IMPRESSIONS	3
The Plurality of Publics	3
The School of Today and the Society of Tomorrow	3
Plurality of Publics and Conflicts of Values	5
Contradictory Expectations	6
The Teacher, Witness to a Self-Questioning Civilization	8
There is No More Unanimity	9
Academic and Vocational Aspirations	10
A PERSONAL POINT OF VIEW	13
Two Types of School System	13
Ingrained Ideas Which Must Be Questioned	14
Ivan Illich the Iconoclast	15
A New Problem of Motivation	16
Mass Education – Individualized	17
The Extension of the Reservoir of Talents	19
The Two Cultural Revolutions	20
The Cultural Revolution and Expectations Relating to Education	22
CONCLUSION	24
REFERENCES	25

INTRODUCTION

For a sociologist, the subject to be treated is dangerous and frustrating. I am asked to say what, in Canada, the individual expects of the school, and to say it in a way that will be sufficiently objective and will rest upon observation. But since there is a grave scarcity of observations in this area, that objectivity becomes illusory, if not mendacious. In contrast to the economist, who is in danger of drowning in an abundance of statistical data on the cost of education, and who must make an effort to disentangle himself from the mass of data and form overall judgements, the sociologist is scratching about on a very scanty ground. And all that he gets from it in the end is empirical data which are diverse, disparate, and of very little significance.

In these conditions, the risk that the sociologist runs is of mixing in his own viewpoint, his personal judgements, with what he claims to be the reality which he has observed. Value judgements and judgements of fact are in danger of being confused. The risk is even greater in an area like education, where personal values are deeply involved, and consequently come to the surface easily, and where the observed facts are too scarce and insignificant.

In these circumstances, it is better to be honest with oneself and with the reader and not play the ostrich: what follows is not a purely "objective" analysis – if it can ever be said that such a thing can exist in sociology. Or more precisely, it is not a matter of presenting here the fruits of an empirical study, stuffed with quantitative data and with scientifically verified facts. Let us make the declaration in all simplicity and candor: the analysis that you are going to read, although based on a fair number of observations and facts, bears the stamp of the personal preferences of the observer. We are well aware, then, that what is being offered is a study based on what I would modestly call the "enlightened prejudices" of the author! On this basis, one can at least hope that this document will stimulate more discussions and critical analyses on the part of its readers than a simple report on a sociological investigation.

However, in an effort of objectivity (perhaps the last twitch of the professional conscience of the sociologist) I have tried to make a distinction between what I shall call the "observations and impressions", which will take up the first part of this document, and the more personal expression of my convictions and opinions, which will be the topic of the

second part of the document. In this way, the reader will more easily be able to judge the influence that my personal opinions – set out in the second part – may have had on the observations and impressions presented in the first part.

OBSERVATIONS AND IMPRESSIONS

The Plurality of Publics

To answer the question "What is it that the individual expects of the school?", it is immediately necessary, at the outset, to make it very clear that what one may call "public opinion" is far from being unanimous. There are in reality several "publics" which have an answer to give to this question, and which answer it in fact in very different ways, because each one perceives and judges the school in a particular perspective and from its own unique viewpoint. Thus, parents, taxpayers, teachers, administrators and students make up so many publics, each of which has its own point of view on the school, and judges it in accordance with its own interests, its own aspirations, its fears, its frustrations, and its hopes. And in the interior of these groups one might go on to distinguish "sub-publics": thus, among students, one would have to make a distinction between adult students and regular students, academic and vocational students, students who are strongly motivated and those who are on the point of dropping out, students who succeed without working and those who work without succeeding, and so on.

The School of Today and the Society of Tomorrow

This plurality of publics is accentuated all the more by the fact that the school, by its very nature, is a very ambiguous reality in relation to the dimension of time. It attaches itself to the past by the tradition and the knowledge that it transmits, it belongs to the present by reason of the collective investments which it demands, and it is involved in the future through the hopes and aspirations which it carries with it. This future orientation in particular seems to me to be of singular importance here. In fact, the school is, in the mind of those who expect something of it, or who no longer expect anything of it, a symbol of tomorrow's society. It opens the door to that society, it is a kind of anteroom to it; or again, it is like a bridge thrown between the present and the future.

The result of this is that the school is sensitive to the optimism or the pessimism of the moment regarding the society of the future. The judgement that one will pass on the school, on what it is or ought to be, is affected by the image which one has of tomorrow's society, and by the hopes or fears which accompany or which evoke that image.

Besides, there is a whole folklore which gives a good illustration of how the perception one has of the school is at the same time a projection into the future. We speak of the school as forming "tomorrow's elites or tomorrow's generations"; we say of the school that it is a "factor in cultural as well as economic development"; we expect the school to open up to our children "easier or more gratifying ways toward the future" than those which we had to follow ourselves. What needs to be documented, however, is rather the content of the expectations held, and the bonds which link these to an image of the society of the future. Research in this area is extremely limited. We shall have recourse here, however, to a certain number of superficial observations.

Many students have a very ambivalent attitude toward the future, inspired by the judgement which they pass on today's society. We hear many young people condemning the consumer society, the technological and anonymous society, the bureaucratic society, the mass society. In their view, this society is particularly well described by the idea of the System, dominated by an "establishment" which is the sole beneficiary of the System, and which tries to maintain it at all costs. This view, simplified though it be, of the society of today and tomorrow is none the less at the root of many of the judgements passed by young people upon the school. The latter seems to them – not without reason, it must be admitted – to be an instrument of the System and of the "establishment" for its own maintenance and perpetuation. To accept the school system, to play the role that one is invited to play in it, to yield to its demands, is already to consent to enter the System, enclose oneself in it, and, thanks to the school, join the ranks of those who profit from it.

So, in the perspective of the society of tomorrow for which the school offers preparation, two conclusions can be reached about education, both derived in part from the same analysis. On the one hand, parents see in the school the channel of access to a superior status in tomorrow's society, and earnestly wish to keep their children in that channel as long and as far as possible, in the hope that they will profit from it later. In opposition to this view, on the other hand, it is precisely because the school appears to them as a symbol of a hierarchic society, stratified in classes and kept subject to exploitation by elites, that certain young people refuse or say that they refuse to enter the System.

Two publics, then, come into confrontation here. Their viewpoints often seem irreconcilable because their judgements on the society of today and tomorrow are profoundly divergent. In reality, the situation is

much more complex. It is only too clear that young people do not form one block having the same attitudes and the same opinions, and that parents are equally far from being unanimous. Among students as among parents, there are differences of viewpoint between those who accept society as it is and who accept integration with it, and those who refuse that society. And between these two poles of opinion, the shades of difference are almost infinite.

Plurality of Publics and Conflicts of Values

It is precisely this great diversity in points of view on the society of today and tomorrow and on education in relation to society, which produces the multiplicity of publics, a phenomenon which is highly characteristic of an evolving society. The faster the pace of social change, the greater the tendency for differing viewpoints to assert themselves and to come into conflict – points of view on society, on its future evolution, and on the objectives of this evolution and the means of achieving them. At the outset, complex industrial societies are characterized by social and cultural pluralism. When a society of this kind is experiencing a phase of rapid evolution, pluralism asserts itself in a much more striking fashion still.

Behind the visible confrontations on the subject of the society of tomorrow what is really being expressed is a series of value conflicts. In a period of re-definition of the society of tomorrow and of re-orientation of the collectivity, different values come into opposition and contradict each other. New values are proposed to replace the old ones; or again, contradictions between traditional values, never before perceived, suddenly come to light, provoking open conflicts which up to now have remained latent or concealed. We see groups confronting each other violently, seeking to assert divergent or contradictory values.

In such a society, and at such a time, what makes the task of the educator so difficult is that the teacher and the school find themselves, by the force of events, at the centre of these value conflicts. They suffer repercussions through the different expectations to which they must try to respond. The educator and school are torn between opposing demands and expectations, between publics which do not agree among themselves, and each of which demands that the educational system yield to its will and respond to its hopes.

Contradictory Expectations

Let us briefly enumerate some of the contradictory expectations to which the educator and the school are subjected. At one and the same time the school is called upon to develop in young people those attitudes favourable to conformity – and even to a certain conformism – which every society demands, and also to stimulate creativity, initiative, the spirit of enterprise, and the capacity for innovation. When school develops a spirit of criticism and freedom of thought in young people, teachers are accused of unsettling their minds, of sowing revolt, of being the precursors of revolution. They are reminded that what is asked of them is to form honest citizens, capable of taking over from their predecessors and continuing what the latter have already done, but on the other hand, if the young show little interest in public affairs, if they appear apathetic, little interested by research, the arts, or science, the school is blamed for having stifled the imagination, for having taught them to repeat the same old things without understanding them, of having stultified their intelligence and having stifled their emotions.

This contradiction goes hand in hand with another which is no less current, which is perhaps another way of expressing the same thing: that is, the opposition between discipline and freedom. Confronted by the new active school, which tries to centre itself upon the pupil and his interests rather than on the program and on the preservation of regular order in the school, many parents, administrators and educators react with the assertion that disorder is being set up as a system, that study is being replaced by play, discipline by permissiveness. Regrets are expressed over the disappearance of the school of long ago, in which, it is said, the students were subjected to rules which taught them respect for order. But at the same time, you will hear other parents, administrators and educators, or sometimes the same ones, declare that the school fails to develop self-discipline, the autonomy of the moral conscience: fails to develop the spirit of criticism, the proper use of freedom, and the capacity to govern one's own conduct and to devise one's own norms of behaviour.

Another well-known contradiction which the contemporary school system is witnessing is the apparent opposition between general education and specialization. At one and the same time, the school is accused of dispensing an education which is too general and an education which is too specialized, of failing to inculcate the fundamentals of scientific knowledge and of failing to prepare students for the technical application of their knowledge. The opposition between these two viewpoints gives

expression, in reality, to a deeper contradiction which one can summarize in the following manner: is it the function of the school to develop the total personality or to give students a good preparation for earning their living in the labour market? Of course, it will be said that these two demands are not contradictory and that the attempt is being made to reconcile them. That is theoretically true. But in practice, the teacher and the school are constantly dragged to and fro between the two demands – or more accurately, between those who put the emphasis on one or other of these two expectations. For there are two definitions of the school there, one which defines it in terms which we may call humanist, and the other which defines it in functionalist terms. And these two definitions of the school often emerge as solidly irreconcilable.

The opposition between general education and specialization has its repercussions upon the role of the teacher. The teacher finds himself compelled to make a choice between being an educator and being a specialized instructor. Here, too, I am well aware that this is a distinction that is not liked, that it is rejected and that the statement is made that there is neither contradiction nor conflict between these two roles which every teacher must simultaneously play. But in fact, the two images do exist, are distinct, draw apart and may eventually come into conflict.(1)

The school, too, is often the victim of the opposition between what I would call preoccupation with detail and the search for the essential. One often hears the reproach raised against the school that it does not penetrate to the essential, this being defined in a very vague manner and often in differing terms. But at the same time, there is pressure on the school and on the teachers to serve ends which are often very superficial. For example, parents who cannot succeed in inducing their boys to have their hair cut or their beard cropped, and their daughters to give up their jeans, entrust this very important task to the school. But at the same time, these same parents rise up against the school when their sons or their daughters are punished for what they regard as "details". And they will demand that educators confine themselves to essential matters.

Another contradiction which appears, notably in a time of political crisis, is that which consists of demanding of teachers that they see to the civic education of the young, while at the same time, forbidding these teachers to discuss political events with their pupils. Of course, the great majority of the population is opposed to turning the school into the instrument of a political ideology. But so little trust is placed in teachers that people would like to see them practise an aseptic and sterilized kind

of education, that is to say a civic education which would be carried on outside of all real, concrete political context. This contradiction appeared with particular force in Quebec, in the course of the recent events that we are familiar with. In a period of crisis, teachers easily become scapegoats: they are suspected – as was the case in Quebec – of inculcating revolutionary ideas in the young, and they are enjoined to refrain from comment on political events; at the same time, they are reproached for having failed to ensure the civic and political education of their pupils.

The Teacher, Witness to a Self-Questioning Civilization

This recital illustrates how both the teacher and the school are at the same time the centre and the evidence of the contradictions of the conflicts of society. Beyond the strictly educational problems which the teacher has to resolve every day in his classroom, he is now confronting in his daily work what one might call the problems of civilization, for which, incidentally, he is even less well equipped and prepared than for the educational problems. Teachers have been trained as if they were responsible only to their pupils and their classrooms. They have not been prepared to take responsibility before all of society and for answering for their education in the perspective of the historical evolution of society. More exactly, they have not been trained to think and to exercise their profession in the perspective of, and in line with, a civilization which is questioning itself and transforming itself.

There, without doubt, is one of the most profound sources of the uneasiness which is prevalent among teachers, in the school system, and in a more general way, in the attitude of individuals and of society towards education. There is the source of the anxiety and the nervousness which can be observed among teachers with regard to the future evolution of their profession and its relationship with the rest of society.

What is happening, I think, is that the teaching force has become more sensitive than before to the criticisms which the school system is subjected to, to the decay of confidence in the school and in its teachers, and to the deterioration of the relationship between the teaching profession and society. As a matter of fact, in the last few years, or at the very most the last few decades, teachers have gained a recognized status in society; they have a relatively satisfactory level of existence. At this particular moment, however, they see themselves suddenly becoming the object of new attacks; they hear talk of new constraints that people want to apply to their profession and to the overall school system. They hear

it said that too much is being spent now on the school system, that the productivity of teaching must be improved, and that a considerable number of teachers should be replaced by electronic devices. At a moment when their position seemed to be becoming more secure, and more respected, teachers suddenly feel themselves threatened again. Hence the uneasiness and the anxiety which is growing within the teaching profession.

One might say that too much and, at the same time, too little is being demanded of the teacher and the school. On the other hand, the school is expected to do all that the family is unable to do. It is asked to form the complete man, to be responsible for moral as well as intellectual education. On the other hand, in practice, it is expected of the school that it provide a means of access to the labour market and a channel for social mobility, and to these ends people are ready to sacrifice many things, including moral training, aesthetic imagination, intellectual curiosity.

It is comprehensible, then, that teachers find themselves in a situation of very painful anxiety. And what is even worse, they know that, whatever choice they make, they will always be the object of criticism, the scapegoats towards whom people turn in a period of anguish and whom people are happy to blame for what they have not been capable of doing themselves.

There is No More Unanimity

The conclusion which emerges from what I have just said is that there is less unanimity than ever before on the topic of what the individual expects of the school. Without there having been, in the past, any perfect unanimity on what one might expect of the school, one might say that there were not in the past all the lines of cleavage that one can observe today among a plurality of publics. The reason for this is simple: in the past and until very recently, secondary education was reserved for only a narrow layer of the population, who selected themselves, principally by socio-economic criteria. It was normal, therefore, that this privileged minority should feel a certain consensus on what it might expect of a school which was exclusively at its service. The increasingly generalized access to secondary studies has made such a consensus impossible, by enlarging and multiplying the different viewpoints according to which different groups form their perceptions and their judgements of the school and of what they can expect of it.

This is one of the still unexplored consequences of the democratization of the school system, that it has shattered a degree of unanimity which did exist earlier as a result of the fact that education remained a class privilege. One can therefore say that the democratization of education is not a process which simplifies the life of the school and of the teaching profession. The democratization of the schools is a process of disruption, because it has the effect of modifying, at the same time, structures and mentalities dating back through centuries, or even thousands of years, forcing us to move into a historical era which is entirely new and without precedent, and about which it is very difficult to foresee where it is leading us.

And it is in the centre of this debate that the teacher stands. He is forced to ask himself questions, all at the same time, about a new method of education, in a new school, in the setting of an emerging civilization, the characteristics of which are still little known to us. To someone who occupies such an uncomfortable position, one obviously cannot say that one will provide the prescriptions for the resolution of the problems which he is encountering. These problems are, indeed, of such a global nature that all that one can do is to invite teachers to develop what I would call a more acute "sociological perception", that is to say, a livelier perceptual sensitivity to those phenomena of civilization which constitute at one and the same time the setting and the scenario within which the teaching profession is now evolving. Teachers must see, more clearly than previously, the impact of the large movements of change in society upon the school and upon their profession, and they must learn to reflect at length upon their new role in this society.

Academic and Vocational Aspirations

The democratization of education presents teachers with another problem to which I would also like to draw attention. If we translate the expression "what the individual expects of the school" into a more properly sociological style of language, it becomes "academic and vocational aspirations", which have been the object of various studies in the United States and in Europe, and more and more also in Canada. In particular, we know now that in Canada, as in other industrial countries, and also in developing countries, the academic and vocational aspirations of students and their parents are not a purely individual phenomenon. What the individual asks of the school, what he expects of it for his own

future or for the future of his children, is largely conditioned by his social milieu. More specifically, this means that aspirations vary according to social class or socio-economic status, according to the cultural climate of the family, according to the type of school attended, and in Canada, according to the spoken tongue. Aspiration with regard to studies and a job is therefore a sociological phenomenon, in this sense that outside of the person himself, certain economic, cultural and social conditions influence his motivation and determine his life. (2)

A certain sociological determinism must therefore be recognized. And it is to the extent that it is recognized, and explored, to the extent that one tries to analyze its variables, that one may hope that individuals will free themselves, at least relatively, from the conditioning to which they have up to now been subjected in a blind and unconscious fashion. The liberation of man, as represented by his autonomous and free access to those studies for which he is fitted and in which he shows interest, must first be attained through recognition of the factors and conditions which limit or inhibit that liberty. (3)

In the new society which is evolving through the process of self-search, one of the important roles of teachers at various levels will be to contribute their share of effort to this liberation. All the research undertaken in different countries shows in fact that teachers themselves can be a factor limiting the freedom of aspiration. By the way in which they guide their students, the advice which they dispense to parents, by the selection which they make and also perhaps through unconscious motivation, teachers accentuate the barrier of social classes, of disadvantaged areas, of economic and cultural obstacles. Teachers are indeed aware of the fact that a child of the working class has, given an equal intelligence quotient, less chance than a middle class child of pursuing advanced studies; in Ontario, teachers consider that the French-speaking students are "generally lacking in certain qualities which favour successful study" (4); and it is in the light of these judgements that teachers guide their students and/or advise parents. But by reason of that very fact, it is the weight of social, economic and cultural conditioning which bears down in this manner, through them, to affect the decisions and the life of the student. The teacher adds to this weight the influence which he has at his own disposal, whether it be because of his prestige or his authority.

We see then in what sense the action of teachers may be re-oriented in the direction of liberation, rather than in the direction of repression.

Teachers who are aware of the social forces which operate outside of them and through them will in future be an important factor in equalizing the opportunities of access to education, with a view to the establishment of a society which will be more authentically democratic. In particular, they will have the function of maintaining at a high level the academic and vocational aspirations of students and their parents, while remaining equally wary of the danger represented as much by aspirations which are too high, and therefore utopian, as by aspirations which are too low. (5)

A PERSONAL POINT OF VIEW

The observations which precede were already, in part, marked by the personal preferences of the author. In this second part, I would like to pose, more openly, certain questions upon which it seems to be imperative for us to reflect, in the setting of the proposed conferences. It is, in fact, impossible to attempt a response to the question "What does the individual expect of the school?" without asking oneself questions about the school itself, its role and its significance in the changing society in which we live in the second half of the twentieth century.

Two Types of School System

What is probably at the bottom of the problems which we are confronting is the fact that the school system was conceived several centuries ago according to a two-fold model: at the basic level, an elementary education more or less widely open, depending on the country or the region, to the entire population; above that level, secondary and higher education accessible only to a small minority, drawn almost exclusively from the privileged classes. Today, for the first time in the history of humanity, the secondary level of education is also becoming wide open – and perhaps even more widely open than the primary level has been until now, and the barriers to higher education are in their turn in the process of being demolished. Such an important fact, coming about in such a rapid fashion, is already provoking and will provoke, to an even greater degree, in the decades lying ahead, some very considerable upheavals.

No one knows today what kind of society it will be in which almost the entire citizen body has at least ten years of schooling. But there is one thing which seems to be emerging more and more clearly: to admit almost the entire membership of a generation, the school system can never again be what it has been in the past. The structures which were traditionally dedicated to the education of a highly selective minority must inevitably shatter when they have to welcome the mass of the population.

In the future, the school system will have to respond to a multiplicity of expectations and aspirations, to a great diversity of talents and interests, to a complex and interwoven network of different pathways. One might say that the old school system was of the "Newtonian" type:

the student traversed a simple and pre-determined orbit, the stages of which and the duration of which he knew. The new school system of today and tomorrow is rather of the "quantum" type, that is to say we must think of the theory of quanta in that it tries to follow a great number of particles each of which pursues its own trajectory in manifold and often unforeseeable directions. In other words, what I want to emphasize by this is that the school system of tomorrow will probably not be a continuation of that of yesterday or of today; it will be so different from these that we shall have to begin to say that we are contemplating *two types* of educational system, that of tomorrow being of a different *nature* from that of yesterday.

Ingrained Ideas Which Must be Questioned

It follows from what I have said that ideas long ago ingrained in us, opinions and situations long ago established, have to be called into question. For example, the belief has prevailed for a very long time that it was normal for a young person to pursue his studies without interruption for 15 or 20 years or more. Today we must realize that this was not a normal thing, but that it was rather quite abnormal. Only "exceptional" children could accept such a way of life and such a course of intellectual endeavour. What seems to me much more normal is that after ten or twelve or fifteen years of study, a young person should feel the need to interrupt his studies, to travel, to work, to take the air and break away, to encounter more real experiences and a less artificial environment than the school and the classroom. It becomes more and more clear, therefore, that the school system of the future will have to be modified so as to integrate some elements which up to now have remained outside it.

Thus, following the example of the Soviet and Chinese school systems, the school system of the future will have to establish a permanent liaison with the world of work. It would be much healthier for the student, more stimulating for his training, and probably also more effective in motivating him if he had the occasion to encounter concrete work experience at the same time as he pursued his studies. To this end, a great number of formulae still have to be explored. Up to now, we have mainly had recourse to alternation between school attendance and work. But one could, for example, think of installing the school in a work setting, just as one already does for doctors, a large part of whose training takes place nowadays in the setting of a hospital, at great expense to the university and to society. What is done in medical training could

also be put into effect at a much lower cost for training in a large number of other occupations and professions. And formulae of this kind would have to be devised for regular students as well as for those who are following in-service training, for there is reason to believe that in the future we shall move towards a less and less clear and rigid distinction between regular education and continuing education.

Travel has become another activity which a great number of young people indulge in with energy and enthusiasm. Many students feel the need, at the end of their secondary studies or during their university career, to visit some corner of the world, to get to know other countries and other civilizations, to enter into communication with other human beings. We must recognize that these journeys have an undeniable educational merit, that they are certainly worth the hours lost from the classrooms or laboratories. So we should be thinking about incorporating this kind of experience in the normal educational process, of giving it a place which will recognize the positive elements that can be found in it for the education of modern man. In a world where political frontiers, though they still exist, and may even still be important, do not nevertheless have the same significance as in the past, it is a fortunate and healthy thing that contemporary youth should wish to gain better acquaintance with the enlarged world which opens to his gaze, to reach wider horizons, and to make contact with the other peoples and races which make up humanity.

Ivan Illich the Iconoclast

What precedes leads us to ask if Ivan Illich is exaggerating greatly when he poses the problem of the new education in the terms which he employs. (6) Illich raises, in particular, two problems. He wonders first of all if it would not be too costly to bring into existence the type of school which is said to be necessary in modern society. He observes, in fact, that in spite of the fabulous sums that are being spent on education, in the industrial countries and proportionately even more in the developing countries, it is calculated that it would be necessary to devote amounts of money several times greater to provide for everyone the high quality education which is said to be appropriate to society and to man today.

Faced with this situation, Ivan Illich concludes that it is going to be impossible to devote to education all the money that would be necessary, because to do so would be to paralyze all economic life. There, in his view, is the proof that it is necessary to look for something else, another type of education, to leave the beaten track and invent a school system which will be much more flexible, closer to reality and at the same time less costly.

In the second place, Ivan Illich believes that education, as it is dispensed at present, constitutes a form of alienation for the great majority of the population. He sees in it, in effect, a mold which is being impressed on the mass of people, to bring it into integration with the system established by the dominant class and in this way to annihilate every contentious, creative and innovative force. Ivan Illich proposes to replace a sterilizing form of education with a kind of free education whose purpose would be to favour creativity, personal initiative, the utilization of the resources of each person, and which would rest upon the fundamental solidarity existing between people who are interested in studying the same questions.

I have had recourse to the arguments of Ivan Illich precisely because he is perhaps the most extremist opponent of the education system as it functions at the present time. He has openly called for the abolition of the school system, and its replacement by radically different modes of apprenticeship. It is probable that the great majority of people – and especially the majority of educators – will not be in agreement with everything that Ivan Illich says and writes about the modern school system. But what we must agree to recognize is that Ivan Illich gives proof of the changes which have become inevitable in education, and he does it in an extremist and radical manner perhaps because he knows all the forces of resistance to change that are to be found in the educational sector. To accept important changes in education presupposes in effect an intellectual conversion and a transformation of set habits, which are often difficult feats to perform.

A New Problem of Motivation

Nevertheless, it has become obvious that the educational system can no longer be today what it was in the past. In particular, a problem of motivation which was not posed in the past is being posed at the present time, in new terms. As long as secondary and higher education were accessible only to a minority of young people, one could take it for granted that, as a consequence of the selection which took place, one would find in the post-elementary educational system only those students whose motivation was modeled according to the structures and the content of the established programs. In other terms, to stay with studies and succeed in them, it was necessary, as was said, "to enjoy study", which meant to have aptitudes for and a lively interest in the only type of program which was offered, to display an inclination for the kind of life that these studies required, and to aspire to spending one's whole life in one of the few professional occupations to which those studies led.

The situation is entirely different today, as a result of the increasingly generalized access to secondary education, and as a result of the opening up of higher education to a growing number of young people. This presupposes very considerable transformations, and we are still very far from knowing with any precision what these will be and where they will lead the school system.

Mass Education – Individualized

To respond to the almost infinitely diversified expectations of the increasingly expanded clientele to which the school system is addressing itself, it is almost necessary to achieve the squaring of the circle: we *are demanding of a system of mass education that it be at the same time individualized*. I believe that it is the specific demands implied by this duality of purpose that are at the heart of the harassment, the ambiguities and the contradictions which educators and school administrators experience. It is undoubtedly not by chance that, in a mass society in which the individual is subjected to a considerable number of pressures and constraints which tend towards standardization of people, the demand rises for an education that is more and more individualized. For example, one of the principal reproaches addressed to the great educational complexes (giant secondary schools, multi-versities), is that they plunge the individual into an anonymous crowd and reduce him to the status of a number. Personally, I do not believe that this criticism is as justified as is claimed. In reality, I believe that the student, as much as the teacher, creates, within these large complexes, his own network of personal relationships. In the interior of great urban complexes, sociologists have observed that one finds a great number of small "villages" which lie side by side beneath the visible fabric of the great anonymous city: these villages may be composed of homogenous ethnic groups, or of a community formed of families which have lived in the same district for two or three generations and cannot imagine themselves being able to live anywhere else in that city than in that district where they have taken root and where they find their natural setting. The same goes for the great educational complexes, the apparent anonymity of which conceals a great number of small groups based on friendship, on common interests, on proximity, and many other factors.

It is still true, however, that in the eyes of a great number of people, especially perhaps of parents but also of educators and students, these great complexes have a character of anonymity and that for them this is probably true. And it is in reaction against these great complexes that they

cry out – not without reason – for an education that is more individualized, more personalized, made to the measure of each student. I would add for my part that with the expansion that has taken place in adult education, this form of education modeled on the person takes on even more importance, given that each adult returns to school with a unique personal experience; which implies that in theory each adult student ought to have a unique program of studies shaped according to his particular needs.

I do not, however, believe that the solution lies in returning to the small secondary school of three hundred or five hundred students. In my opinion, the comprehensive school with some 2000 students is necessary both to offer the range of options required and to form a social setting large enough for the adolescent to learn freedom, responsibility and competition, as well as solidarity. But I believe that it is necessary to find other ways towards a more personalized education. In particular, I am convinced that we are far from having explored all the "natural" educational resources which the great school complexes offer. We continue to believe that the teacher in front of the blackboard is the principal, if not the only, instrument of learning. And yet the natural groups which form themselves on the basis of friendship, or around common interests, or on the occasion of a collective effort of research or some other enterprise, could become micro-communities of learning among equals if we knew how to stimulate them, encourage them, let them operate while nourishing them with suggestions and information. Many young people ask no more than to be able to work in a setting more free and more spontaneous than traditional classrooms.

One wonders sometimes what sociologists and social psychologists are good for. I suggest that we ought to make the experiment of employing them in big secondary schools, asking of them only that they pay constant attention to the life of the spontaneous groups or the natural groups which form, and that they observe all the opportunities which present themselves for an education of a less formal character than that of the classroom. Such action could not be carried out effectively by a sociologist or a social psychologist whose objective is to undertake rigorous research, necessarily requiring time and equipment. But I know some young sociologists who are interested rather in different forms of action, based on an awareness of reality which is more intuitive than strictly scientific. For my part, although I appreciate the dangers of such an intuitive awareness, which depends on a gift or an aptitude almost of an innate character, I am ready to place trust in it to the extent that the person applying it is intelligent, honest and possessing a solid basic scientific training.

The Extension of the Reservoir of Talents

What I have just said about the future prospects for a more individualized education leads me to offer another of my prejudices for discussion. I believe that the psychologists have up to now got us too much into the habit of conceiving the reservoir of talent in a society as static. Thus, it is said that only a given proportion of each generation has the necessary intelligence to proceed to higher education and that this limitation is a kind of ceiling described, in statistical language, as what one calls "the normal curve of intelligence quotients". I believe that we must make an effort to break away from that image, and to conceive the reservoir of talents rather as something elastic. It is my most profound conviction that by improving the conditions of life of the disadvantaged, by raising the level of popular culture through the mass media of communication, by favouring adult education and what is now called permanent or continuous education, one can bring about a striking increase in the mental and intellectual capacity of the population as a whole. And one would also increase the level of motivation toward self-education – which is perhaps more important than the intelligence quotient itself for academic and professional success.

I am often amazed to observe that education, which is by its very nature a kind of act of faith in man and his possibilities of development, bases itself for its structure and development on a static image of the evolution of man. I believe that today we must, on the contrary, consider with optimism and confidence the possibilities of the human being, as well as of humanity itself, for progress and evolution. I like to believe that the human species has in reserve a hidden capacity for intellectual and mental development, surpassing anything that we can imagine. Since the beginnings of man until the present time, human intelligence has been asleep and under-developed in the great majority of the members of the species. Only a narrow social layer throughout all the history of humanity has experienced the economic, social and cultural conditions of life which favour the development of intelligence. We cannot yet imagine what will be the power, for better or worse, of the human species when the great majority of its members have reached the same level of mental development as has been achieved up to now by only a tiny minority of the people.

I believe that we are at the present moment at the dawning of a new era which will allow a hitherto unheard-of development of human intelligence and of the reservoir of talents which humanity has at its disposal. Of course, in saying that, I do not pretend to deny nor to overlook the

genetic effects of heredity. But the majority of researchers who have recently applied themselves to the problem of the connection between heredity and environment reach the conclusion that it is not possible to distinguish with any clarity the exclusive effect of the one or the other, and that for the time being it is better to consider these two factors as being bound together by a kind of indissoluble marriage. (7) For my part, I am convinced that the improvement of the economic, social and cultural environment will raise the hereditary quality of intelligence, so that heredity itself must not be considered as a static and firmly established factor. I believe too that a new approach to the process of education, more dynamic and less formal, ought to have the same effect. (8)

The Two Cultural Revolutions

It is here, I think, that there emerges the importance of what is called "the cultural revolution in the modern world". You may speak of cultural revolution in two clearly different senses. In one sense, we mean by cultural revolution the recent proliferation of the symbolic or cultural universe in which man lives and which constitutes the nourishment and the structural support of his intelligence. A great number of new images, concepts, ideas, fantasies and myths have appeared and are in circulation. Man has extended the horizons of his knowledge, he has given freer reign to his imagination, he has given more attention than in the past to his emotions and his sensations. The result has been the appearance and the entry into circulation of a great number of new symbols, a hitherto unknown expansion of this sphere of symbolism which constitutes an essential part of the world in which and through which man acts.

One might also add that in this first sense, the cultural revolution means that an ever-increasing proportion of the human population has access to a very important part of the symbolic universe. In other words, in ancient societies a rich symbolic universe was accessible only to a narrow section of the population. Today, with expanded education and mass means of communication, the knowledge and the symbols which were hitherto reserved to an elite are circulating more and more freely in the population as a whole.

Understood in this first sense, the cultural revolution is therefore the result of a greater production of symbols and at the same time an intensified circulation of these symbols.

But there is a second sense which is also given to the idea of cultural revolution. It is that of a radical change in the content of thought and idea. This form of cultural revolution came about in its most extreme form in China in recent times, when, on the impulse and at the direction of Mao Tse Tung and his wife, the attempt was made to purge the mind and the life of the Chinese of every vestige of the feudal and capitalist China which had existed before Communism. What we must see, across the excesses and the extremism which accompanied the Chinese cultural revolution, and what we must bear in mind, is the intention to create in China a new kind of man, whose thought and ethics will be molded to suit the demands of socialist society. Thus it is hoped that with the memory of feudal and capitalist China will perish also in the Chinese consciousness the last reflexes of man as he used to be. With absolute truth, it has to be recognized, Mao Tse Tung realized that one could not create a new society without creating a new type of man; one cannot put a society through a revolution without a profound moral, intellectual and – I would dare to say – spiritual conversion of man. This urge to remake socialist man also marked the first stages of the Soviet regime, especially under the direction of Lenin. But it was only in China that the impulse went so far towards the explicit and total break with the pre-revolutionary revolutionary universe.

In an attenuated form, less radical but perhaps equally violent, part of the youth of America is also living through another form of cultural revolution. I am referring to that part of the youth of America which is asserting that it is emancipated from the rest of society, and which is doing so by adopting various forms of negation or opposition, whether it be in the garment of the hippie, or in the ranks of the protesters on campus, or of those who have taken to drugs, or again those who have adopted a marginal life style (as in the case of those who are referred to as the "street people", whom one finds gathered in particular around the great university campuses, like those of Berkeley and Harvard). It is not by chance that these young people draw their inspiration from Mao, from Ho Chi Min, or from Oriental philosophers or mystics. It is precisely there that they are looking for the source of new symbolism, a new vision of the world which cuts across what they have observed in their own society and what they are rejecting. That is indeed the mark of what can authentically be called a cultural revolution.

In Canada, we are beginning to feel the effects of the cultural revolution among the young, but in a manner which so far has remained relatively modest, less dramatic than in the United States and in certain

European countries (such as England, Sweden, France and perhaps West Germany.) The rupture between the young and the rest of society is not as profound and radical as it is in those countries. Nevertheless, the effects of the cultural revolution are already very evident on our university campuses, in our secondary schools, the discotheques, and the various young people's clubs.

The Cultural Revolution and Expectations Relating to Education

Such profound transformations in ways of thinking as those which I have just been describing very briefly are bound to have considerable effects on the world of education. In particular, when we stop to ask ourselves now what the individual expects of the school, we can no longer answer that question without reference to the shifting, new and increasingly different context of tomorrow's civilization, which is emerging painfully through the conflicts, struggles and spasms which we must endure today. I would like to emphasize in particular that this is the context of the problem of the personalization of education which I spoke of earlier. It may be appropriate to recall that we are witnessing in this connection a radical reversal of viewpoint. The Nineteenth century was dominated by the liberal and individualistic ideology, inspired at the same time by capitalism, protestantism and the industrial revolution. In the context of the Nineteenth century, it was the protesters and the reformers who preached the integration of the individual in society, and even his fusion with the great mass of humanity. For example, August Comte was going against the current when he proposed a kind of atheistic religion of Humanity, made up of respect and devotion to the idea of human collectivity. In his view, the survival of the individual was not that which was imagined by religion, in a sort of ethereal heaven or a second life modeled on the first; true survival he saw rather in the continuation of self through the contribution that each man makes to the survival and the improvement of humanity. Following a totally different line, but one which has a much greater impact, the socialist thinkers, particularly those whose inspiration was marxist, also asserted, in their fashion, the superiority of collective action over individualism, of social justice over individual interests, and of the future of humanity over personal happiness.

During the first half of the twentieth century, one may say that the ideology of community made considerable progress, and that it made gains in all directions. For example, an artist like Molinari saw the perfection of man in his absorption into the bosom of humanity. On the other

hand, Teilhard DeChardin, scientist and mystic, put the emphasis on the solidarity of men and the unity towards which he believed humanity to be moving.

In the last few years, the point of view has completely changed. Without returning to the individualism of the Nineteenth century, we have above all brought to light the dehumanization which is liable to be produced by the mass society, bureaucratized and "informationized", to borrow the expression used by the French sociologist Paul-Henry Chombart de Lauwe, (9) that is to say exposed to all the influences of the mass techniques of communications and to the organizing ability of computers. This fear of society built up into a kind of monstrous System has found expression in all kinds of ways, whether in Huxley or in Kafka, in science fiction or in the form of novels or films.

And the message has been put across. All, or almost all, young people are convinced that the gravest threat hanging over them is that of being absorbed by the infernal machine of collectivity, of being dehumanized, alienated and depersonalized by an anonymous and soulless system.

It is in the context of this obsessive fear and as a means of reacting against this threat – whether it be real or imaginary is of little importance here – that we find, in my opinion, the desire which is so strongly expressed to see the school and the school system return to a personalized form of education, in order to assert the value of personal thought, creativity and autonomy, and to fight against the excessively strong forces of society.

CONCLUSION

I would like to end this essay by placing the debate in the context of the present two-fold cultural revolution. I believe, in effect, that the world of tomorrow, into which we have already entered, will never again be the same as before and that it will continue to differ increasingly, in a more and more radical fashion, from the world of the past. For the moment, it is perhaps the school which, in spite of appearances, is changing least rapidly and least radically. But there, as in the other aspects of life, we must expect difficult and painful transformations. The most obvious proof of this is that it is precisely the school system that has been the principal target of the Chinese cultural revolution. Before seeing teachers publicly put on trial, as commonly happened in China during the cultural revolution, we ought perhaps to undertake without delay a kind of "self-criticism", as it is called in the language of the same communist China. It is in that spirit that I have composed the second part of this essay. My only wish is that it may be read and discussed with a similar intention.

REFERENCES

(1) This opposition between general education and specialization, in education and in the role of the teacher, has been well brought to light in the Canadian study by John Seeley, R. Alexander Sim and Elizabeth W. Loosley, *Crestwood Heights*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1956, Chapter 8.

(2) For Canada, see particularly the enquiry carried out by Raymond Breton and John C. MacDonald on behalf of the Department of Manpower and Immigration. The first volume, composed particularly of basic tables, has been published under the title *Career Decisions of Canadian Youth*, Ottawa, Queen's Printer, 1967. The second volume, in which will be found the analysis of statistics, is at present in the hands of the printer.

(3) An example of the obstacles presented by social class in the disadvantaged quarters of a city like Montreal will be found in "Education in Disadvantaged Areas", an extract from a report prepared by the Conseil de développement social de Montreal, entitled *Operation: Rénovation sociale* and reproduced in part in *École et société au Québec. Éléments d'une sociologie de l'éducation*, Montreal: Éditions H.M.H., 1970, pp. 329-359.

(4) See on this point the *Report of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism*, Ottawa, Queen's Printer, 1968, pp. 74-94 and particularly p. 90. It will also be helpful to consult the article by A.J.C. King, "Ethnicity and School Adjustment", *The Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology*, 5, 2 (May 1968), 84-91; and Richard A. Carlton, "Differential Educational Achievement in a Bilingual Community", doctoral thesis, University of Toronto, 1967.

(5) It does in fact happen that aspirations are "abnormally" high, that is to say that they reach far beyond what one knows to be possible and capable of realization. See, for example, on this point, the report of the enquiry carried out in Quebec into the aspirations and living standards of employed persons by Marc-Adelard Tremblay and Gerald Fortin, *Les Comportements économiques de la famille salariée de Québec*, Laval University Press, 1964, especially chapter XI.

(6) Among the works of Ivan Illich, see particularly the article "Why We Must Abolish Schooling", published in *The New York Review of Books*, XV, 1, 2 July 1970, pp. 9-15; a French translation will be found under the title "Descolariser la société", in *Les temps modernes*, 27, no. 289-290, pp. 475-495. See also a complementary article by the same author: "Commencement at the University of Puerto Rico", in *The New York Review of Books*, XIII, 6, 9 October 1969, pp. 12-15.

(7) The impassioned debate provoked in the United States by the study by Arthur R. Jensen and William Shockley on the I.Q. of Blacks in comparison with Whites is well known. For my part, I concur entirely with the conclusion of the geneticists Walter F. Bodmer and Luigi Luca Cavalli-Sforza, in their article "Intelligence and Race", *Scientific American*, 223, 4 (October 1970), 19-29, when they write: "We therefore suggest that the question of a possible genetic basis for the race I.Q. difference will be almost impossible to answer satisfactorily before the environmental differences between U.S. blacks and whites have been substantially reduced" (p. 29).

(8) The most optimistic psychologist on this topic is undoubtedly Jerome S. Bruner, who considers that we are still very far from knowing the immense possibilities of the human mind. See in particular his *Toward a Theory of Instruction*, New York: W.W. Norton and Company, Inc., 1968.

(9) Paul-Henry Chombart de Lauwe, Introduction to the book *Aspirations et transformations sociales*, published under the direction of the same author, Paris: Editions Anthropos, 1970, page 22.